DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 265 911 JC 860 081

AUTHOR Ryder, Henry D.; Perabo, George W.
TITLE The Complex Challenge of Professional Development: Current Trends and Future Opportunities.
SPONS AGENCY Princeton Univ., NJ. Mid-Career Fellowship Program.
PUB DATE Sep 85
NOTE 41p.; In: Current Issues for the Community College: Essays by Fellows in the Mid-Career Fellowship Program at Princeton University (JC 860 072).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; *College Faculty; Community Colleges; *Faculty Development; Faculty Evaluation; *Job Satisfaction; *Professional Development; Questionnaires; State Surveys; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Effectiveness; Teacher Improvement; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *New Jersey

ABSTRACT

In 1984-85, a study was conducted to gather information about current professional development policies in New Jersey's county colleges, professional development activities and opportunities, the effectiveness of these activities, variations among campuses and disciplines, and incentives for participation. The study involved surveys of the academic deans of New Jersey's 19 community colleges and of 1,094 faculty members at eight of the institutions. Study findings, based on responses from 17 academic deans and 401 faculty members, included the following: (1) industry experience and doctoral programs were felt to have the greatest impact on teaching, while publication had the least; (2) as faculty members grew older, their perception of the effectiveness of doctoral studies diminished; (3) while only 26% of responding faculty members who had been employed 5 years or less had pursued a doctorate since their employment, 46% of those who had been employed over 6 years had pursued a doctorate; (4) with respect to their plans for professional development, 86% of the respondents planned to attend conferences and 52% planned to publish; (5) the three factors that were consistently linked to increased job satisfaction and challenge were recognition, more pay, and better prepared students in class; and (6) the professional development activities identified by the deans as encouraged at the college included mini-grants for research, membership in professional associations, participation in workshops and conferences, travel, and publication. The survey instruments and a tally of the 401 faculty respondents cross tabulated by rank are appended. (EJV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED265911

IX.

THE COMPLEX CHALLENGE OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT:

CURRENT TRENDS AND FUTURE OPPORTUNITIES

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

T. K. RABB

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

X Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Henry D. Ryder
Business Studies Division
Gloucester County College

and

George W. Perabo
Humanities Department
Ocean County College

JC 860 081

Acknowledgements

The results produced by this research would have been impossible without the help of many people. They include Dr. Raymond Gangi, Professor of Computer Science, Gloucester County College, for his invaluable help in guiding the writing of the computer program; Larry Cohen, Middlesex County College; William Engler, Mercer County College; Julianne Hart, County College of Morris; Joseph Kudless, Somerset County College; Joseph Santora, Essex County College; and Mary Lou Wagner, Brookdale Community College, all of whom distributed and collected the questionnaires at their colleges.

The rapid expansion of knowledge in the last half of the twentieth century has made it increasingly difficult for any professional to stay abreast of developments in his area of expertise. Yet the need to acquire new knowledge is essential for most professionals, and it is no less important for an academic than for an architect or a surgeon. Professional development for a college teacher, however, is different from the development of other professionals: rather than being self-employed or working in a small profit-making firm, college teachers work for non-profit institutions and work in much greater concentrations, often numbering in the hundreds on the same campus.

Two year colleges are different still. Because they emphasize teaching rather than research or publication, professional development at these colleges generally has one aim: to improve the effectiveness of teaching. Although this goal may seem simple, the subjective nature of personal and professional growth, the realities of time constraints at two year colleges, and the difficulty in knowing precisely how to improve teaching effectiveness complicate the issue of professional development and make it a difficult and multifaceted challenge.

Our goal in this study is to begin to address that challenge. Our concern, particularly with regard to New Jersey's nineteen community colleges, is to raise significant questions about

professional development, to present our research findings, to evaluate those findings, to dispel some commonly held misconceptions, and to offer some suggestions on how the effectiveness of faculty professional development in New Jersey's community colleges can be increased.

Our initial concern developed because we both sensed a "graying" faculty at these colleges--a faculty growing older and so caught up in the burdens of exhaustive teaching schedules that they had little time to step back and reflect on their goals, little time to study the latest research in their fields, and little time to revitalize themselves intellectually. Because of these initial concerns, we were interested in finding some creative ways to allow community college teachers to maintain their heavy loads and at the same time have regular opportunities for professional development, study, and reflection.

These concerns led us to formulate several questions: What kinds of professional development activities will be most beneficial for community college teachers? What are the best ways of encouraging these kinds of professional development? What motivates faculty to undertake these activities? Who is responsible for developing a college's faculty?

Before any of these subjective questions could be answered, it was necessary to seek answers to more quantifiable questions: What are the current policies regarding professional development at New Jersey's county colleges? What are the current activities and opportunities? How effective are they? How do they vary from campus to campus? How do they vary among different disciplines, ranks, and age groups? What kinds of incentives do colleges provide to encourage

pursuit of these activities? Are there professional development activities that are both inexpensive and effective?

Research Methodology

To answer these questions, in December 1984 we sent a questionnaire requesting information about faculty to the academic deans of New Jersey's 19 community colleges (see Appendix 1). During the ensuing three months, all but two were returned. These questionnaires provided basic information concerning a college's size, growth and faculty turnover, as well as information about its approach to professional development.

In February 1985 faculty questionnaires were distributed to the faculty at eight community colleges--those eight who had representatives in the Mid-Career Fellowship Program at Princeton University (see Appendix 2). One fellow from each of the colleges distributed and then collected the completed forms. Of the 1094 questionnaires distributed, 401, or 36.7%, were returned, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1 - Summary of Returned Questionnaires

College	Distributed	Returned	Percent Returned
Gloucester	73	58	79%
Ocean	95	51	54%
Somerset	82	41	50%
Morris	184	89	48%
Middlesex	211	71	34%
Mercer	132	31	23%
Essex	149	33	22%
Brookdale	168	27	16%
	1094	401	36.7%

The results were tabulated on an Apple IIc computer using a program written for that purpose. Results were first tabulated for the entire response group. Then cross tabulations were completed for the following sub-groups: age, rank, discipline, college, and years

taught at that college. Total responses for each group and the respective percentages are in parentheses. (All data is included in Appendix 3.)

Age:
- Under 30 (4 - 1%)
- Thirty to forty-five (225 - 56%)
- Forty-six to sixty (156 - 39%)
- Over 60 (14 - 4%)
- No response (2 - 0%)

Years taught at that college:
- Two or less (21 - 5%)
- Three to five (42 - 10%)
- Six to 10 (80 - 20%)
- More than 10 (255 - 64%)
- No response (3 - 1%)

Rank:
- Instructor (54 - 14%)
- Assistant professor (117 - 29%)
- Associate professor (160 - 40%)
- Full professor (61 - 15%)
- No response (9 - 2%)

Discipline:
- English (51)
- Humanities (51)
- Social Science (54)
- Mathematics (58)
- Science (40)
- Business and computers (64)
- Nursing (39)
- Health and physical education (17)
- Counseling (11)
- Librarians (8)
- No response (8)

Research Results

Effect of Pursued Activities

Faculty members were first asked to consider the professional development activities they had pursued while employed at their respective colleges and to rank those activities according to which ones they felt had made them better teachers (1 = no effect on teaching, 2 = some effect, 3 = great effect). The second column in Table 2 shows a weighted average of those responses; thus, of those

who pursued doctoral work, the average response (2.40) falls about half way between having "some effect" on teaching (2.00) and having a "great effect (3.00).

Table 2 - Activities Pursued by All Respondents

Activity	Perceived Effectiveness (Weighted average)	Percent who Pursued
Industry experience	2.41	46%
Doctoral	2.40	42%
Conferences	2.24	93%
Other graduate work	2.21	69%
Publication	1.85	26%

Among those who had pursued activities listed on the questionnaire, industry experience and doctoral programs had the greatest positive impact on teaching, while publication had the least. Attending professional conferences was by far the most popular but was seen as having less effect than doctoral studies or industry experience.

When the various population groups are cross-tabulated, trends become apparent that are not apparent when tabulated by rank or length of employment. First, as faculty members grow older, the perception of the effectiveness of doctoral studies diminishes. That is, as one gets older, the pursuit of a doctorate is perceived as having less and less effect on teaching. There is, however, a corresponding increase in the perceived effectiveness of other graduate work and industry experience (see Table 3).

Doctoral work is perceived to have the greatest effect on teaching by physical education (2.75 weighted average), English (2.53), and social science faculty (2.64), and the least effect by business (2.27), science (2.23) and math (2.07) faculty. Perceptions of industry experience are nearly reversed, with the greatest effect

perceived by physical education (2.71), math (2.63), and business (2.56) faculty, and the least effect by social science (1.94) and English (2.07) faculty. Publication was generally not seen as helpful although the weighted average of English faculty (2.11) was higher than the others.

Table 3 - Weighted Averages of Activities Pursued by Faculty in Various Age Groups

Activity	30-45	46-60	over 60
Doctoral	2.49	2.36	2.00
Publication	1.87	1.85	1.75
Industry experience	2.40	2.43	2.58
Other graduate work	2.16	2.21	2.72

The fact that the the weighted average for industry experience is so high is significant. It indicates that this relatively non-traditional approach to professional development should be given increased attention by two-year colleges. The data also show that the approach must be designed for specific populations, because different approaches have different impacts on various ages and disciplines.

Professional Activities Pursued and Planned

Among activities pursued, one group of statistics is significant: while only 26% of responding faculty members who had been employed five years or less had pursued a doctorate since their employment, nearly half (46%) of those who had been employed over six years HAD pursued a doctorate. Moreover, 47% of the responding associate professors and 70% of all responding full professors had pursued a doctorate since beginning their employment. Since doctoral work was perceived by those who had pursued it as having a great effect on their teaching (2.40 weighted average for all 401 respon-

dents), this statistic becomes significant when compared to the activities which other faculty members plan to pursue.

Table 4 - Percentages of Faculty Who Pursued Doctoral Work

Age		Rank		Length of Employment	
30-45	45%	Instructor	22%	Less than 2 years	19%
46-60	39%	Assistant prof.	33%	3 - 5 years	33%
Over 60	36%	Associate prof.	47%	6 - 10 years	47%
		Full professor	70%	Over 10 years	45%

Responding faculty who plan to pursue professional development activities ranked their plans in the order shown in Table 5. These percentages are significant because with the exception of conferences, the order of the plans is in reverse order compared to what faculty believe has the greatest effect on their teaching. Industry experience and doctoral studies, for instance, the two activities which faculty members plan to pursue least, rank highest by those who have pursued them in terms of how helpful they are in improving their teaching.

Table 5 - Planned Activities

Activity	Percent Who Plan to Pursue	Perceived Effectiveness by Those Who Have Pursued
Conferences	86%	2.24
Publication	52%	1.85
Other graduate work	38%	2.21
Industry experience	35%	2.41
Doctoral program	20%	2.40

This suggests that there is apparently poor communication between those faculty who have pursued these activities and those who have not. The advice of Paul Lacey supports this conclusion. In a 1983 essay on revitalizing teaching, Lacey finds that "helping junior faculty find their place in the profession should be a major

focus of any faculty development program. This entails encouraging the junior person to make connections with the appropriate senior colleagues, role models, and mentors" (100). If, as this data suggests, those who have pursued doctoral studies and industry experience have found that these activities have had the greatest impact on improving their effectiveness as teachers, then they are not helping the junior faculty to know this; they are not helping the less experienced faculty to know what professional development activities are the most helpful for improving teaching. The result is that faculty plans are apparently not aimed at maximizing their impact on teaching.

When planned activities are cross-tabulated with the various disciplines, plans for working in industry are significantly higher among math and business faculty than among English or social science faculty. Table 6 shows that these plans correspond closely to the effectiveness perceived by those who have pursued industry experience. That is, plans are greatest in disciplines where effectiveness is highest. While this result is as it should be, it demonstrates again that not all activities are suited for faculty in all disciplines.

Table 6 - Plans to Pursue and Effect of Industry Experience

Discipline	Plan to Pursue Industry Experience	Perceived Impact by Those Who Pursued
Math	57%	2.63
Business	52%	2.56
Science	30%	2.39
English	22%	2.07
Social Science	15%	1.94

Job Challenge and Satisfaction

What challenges faculty? What satisfies them? Based on the

survey results, the three most consistent factors that would increase job challenge and satisfaction are recognition ("More recognition for a job well done," which was checked on 69% of all questionnaires returned), "more pay" (59%), and "better prepared students in class" (57%). These three factors are generally first across all measured populations: age, rank, discipline, and length of employment. Pay and advancement are, as would be expected, more important to faculty in lower ranks and decrease in importance as rank increases. However, recognition and desire for better prepared students increase as rank increases, thus becoming an increasingly important factor (see Table 7).

Table 7 - Perceptions of Selected Challenge Factors by Rank

Factor	Instructor	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Full Professor
Pay	61%	72%	53%	49%
Promotion	59%	56%	33%	18%
Students	44%	58%	61%	61%
Recognition	63%	68%	68%	77%

The factors having least effect on challenge and satisfaction are "a better maintained campus" (22%), "more control over course content and/or materials" (15%), and "having a more understanding supervisor"(10%). Supervision, in fact, was rated last in nearly every population group. The low rating of the intrinsic factor of more control over course content was puzzling; its relative insignificance, however, may result from the fact that control over course content may be perceived as being already high by the respondents.

At least two conclusions can be reached from this data. First, with the exception of pay, job challenge is increased by intrinsic

factors such as recognition, students, and advancement. Extrinsic factors, such as supervision, college policies, and working conditions, have little effect on job challenge or satisfaction. (Had the questionnaire asked for factors that increase just challenge, rather than challenge OR satisfaction, the importance of pay would probably have been less.) Other research supports this finding. Meledez and Guzman (1983) find that faculty are rarely motivated by external factors. Paraphrasing a conclusion from Wilbert and McKeachie, they argue that "extrinsic rewards alone--an increase in salary and promotion--do not motivate professors to improve the quality of their teaching. Intrinsic rewards are the factors that motivate effective teaching"(59). Thus, to increase motivation, emphasis should be placed on intrinsic factors such as better prepared students and recognition. (The responses did not make clear how this should be accomplished.)

Second, administrative approaches to motivation should change as the age of the faculty increases. Since perceptions change as faculty become older, administrative policies must also change. Policies such as increasing pay and promotions, which may have been effective ten years ago, will not necessarily be effective in the future. Other methods of motivation will become necessary.

Some of the most startling conclusions about professional development in general came from the faculty responses about current job challenge--especially when faculty responses were contrasted with responses from academic deans. For most faculty, job challenge comes from student interaction, from keeping current in the field, or from teaching itself. Table 8 summarizes faculty responses to the question "If you do [find your job challenging], what makes it

challenging?

Table 8 - Sources of Current Job Challenge

Response	Percent responding
Student interaction/ helping them learn	34%
Keeping current in the field	11%
Student interaction and keeping current	14%
Teaching/ finding new and better ways	9%
Variety and solving problems	6%
Personal challenge	5%
The subject itself	1%
Course and program development	2%
Other	1%
No response	19%

The fact that only 19% failed to respond to this open-ended question is significant. In addition, in response to the question "Do you find your job challenging?" 62% of all respondents rated their job as "mostly" challenging, and 26% rated it "always" challenging. Only 11% find their job infrequently challenging. On a scale of 1 (never) to 4 (always), the weighted average of all responses was 3.14. These responses certainly seem to dispell the myth about widespread burnout among community college faculty. (It should be noted here, however, that faculty were given only four choices with no midway choice between "mostly" challenging and "infrequently" challenging. It could also be argued that the 64% who did not answer the survey include a large number of burnouts. Thus the very high and positive rating for job challenge may be somewhat misleading.)

Conclusions that can be drawn from these responses are encouraging. The extent of job challenge is pervasive. Job challenge did not significantly vary from the average as rank and length of employment increased, although it did increase with age as shown by Table 9. A similar result was uncovered by Cohen and Brawer in a

1977 survey of nearly 2000 instructors from 156 two-year colleges (81). Job challenge and satisfaction apparently increase with age. Even more significant, the data show that over two-thirds of responding faculty find challenge in the areas that one would hope would be true for community college faculty: student interaction, keeping current in one's field, and improvement of teaching.

Table 9 - Perceptions of Job Challenge

Rank	Weighted Average	Years Teaching	Weighted Average	Age	Weighted Average
Instructor	3.22	under 2	3.19	30-45	3.06
Assistant prof.	3.12	3 to 5	3.21	46-60	3.23
Assoc. prof.	3.16	6 to 10	3.15	over 60	3.46
Full prof.	3.13	over 10	3.13		

But when these faculty responses are placed alongside those from the responding academic deans, the conclusions are not quite so heartening. Eleven of the deans ranked their own faculty as only "somewhat" challenged. Perhaps more significant is the fact that only five deans mentioned any plans to increase job challenge. Two of the deans mentioned the improvement of teaching as the goal of their faculty development program. ("Primary goal is improvement of teaching," and "Essentially, our focus is improving teaching and learning. Our program of professional development revolves around this.") Perhaps most significant of all is that these were the only two deans who mentioned improving teaching and learning, and none mentioned enhancing faculty-student relationships--yet these are the very factors that faculty members find provide the most challenge.

When deans were asked what types of professional development were encouraged at their colleges, dean after dean mentioned activities such mini-grants for research, membership in professional

organizations, participation in workshops and conferences, travel, and publication. Yet none of these is directly related to teaching and student interaction, the activities in which faculty find the most challenge.

Discussion of Results

Is it possible to help faculty recognize those activities which are worth pursuing, those activities which will improve their effectiveness as teachers? Is it possible to help administrators recognize those activities which will provide the most challenge and satisfaction for faculty? Is it possible, ultimately, to create a better alignment between what faculty see as important and challenging in their jobs and what administrators see as worth encouraging? And if these goals are possible, how might they best be accomplished?

We believe these goals are achievable, but reaching them will require major realignments in the thinking and policies at community colleges. As we see it, four modes of thinking need to be addressed.

In the late 1960s and early 1970s, as New Jersey's community colleges began and grew, there was a nationwide tendency in higher education to emphasize programs that would revitalize entire institutions: on-campus speakers, on-campus workshops, and on-campus seminars. According to a survey of professional development research done in the late 1970s be Sally Shake Gaff and others, this tendency increased as the administrative awareness of the need for professional development increased (69). Policies frequently developed at young community colleges whereby professional development activities (1) were administered and directed from the president down, (2) were aimed at correcting deficiencies or weaknesses in individual faculty

members, (3) were generally campus-wide activities in which all were encouraged to participate, and (4) were rewarded by administrators who "counted" participation in such activities on faculty performance evaluations. Evaluations that included active participation invariably led to more tangible rewards such as promotion and salary increases. Policies incorporating these concepts were generally regarded as healthy and constructive, and such policies, or vesitges of them, are apparently still in effect at most New Jersey county colleges.

The conclusions we've inferred from the results of our survey, along with results from recent research on professional development, have led us to realize that all four of these concepts, although well intentioned, are now outdated. While these modes of thinking and their consequent policies may have provided benefits for a new college with a generally young faculty, county colleges are no longer in their infancy and their faculties are now more mature. Accordingly, all four of these policies need to be reviewed in light of the current faculty.

First, faculty development, instead of being directed and administered from the top down, must be initiated by the individual. The more sophisticated the faculty, the more that pressure from above becomes ineffective. Steven Phillips, writing in the bulletin of the Association of Departments of English, insists that faculty development "is and must be a strictly voluntary activity" (12). That is, the desire for change, growth, and development must come naturally from within the faculty member. While an institution may publicize opportunities and provide funding and released time for appropriate activities, the initial impetus for growth must be a

private, personal, and natural desire for growth. Pressure from above for faculty development will encourage faculty to pursue activities for the wrong reasons, for "good" evaluations by superiors rather than for real personal growth and improvement of teaching.

The concept of self-initiated professional development is especially important for those faculty who have reached middle age and beyond. According to Harold Hodgkinson's study of academics in middle age--what he calls "middlescence"--the nature of adult learners is such that external pressures to change will be resisted and ultimately resented. He sees middle-aged faculty, like middle-aged students, as "unfinished products [still] capable of learning new skills and strategies and growing and changing". And while this condition "paves the way" for professional development, it does so only when the individual wants to change and grow (68). The impetus for personal and professional growth must willingly come from within.

Table 10
Perceptions of College-Provided Inventives
for Professional Development

Incentive	Weighted average
Promotion	2.15
Sabbatical	2.12
Tuition reimbursement	2.10
Salary increase	2.08
Released time	1.95

Our survey results support this conclusion since none of the external incentives for development stand out as being either particularly effective or particularly ineffective for the faculty as a whole, as shown by Table 10. All the weighted averages (3.0 = great incentive, 2.0 = some incentive, 1.0 = no incentive) are clustered

around 2.0, or "some" incentive. Thus, since none of the college-provided incentives stands out as providing great incentive, the real incentive must come from some other, non-external source.

A second mode of thinking that has also been translated into policy at many schools is that faculty development should be aimed at correcting deficiencies in faculty members. The atmosphere created by such thinking cannot be anything but negative. Certainly faculty members have areas in which they can improve, but we would agree with Lacey's view, expressed in his "Politics of Vitalizing Teaching" that successful faculty development occurs only when the activities are not considered remedial:

> A politically astute program acknowledges, respects, and plays to faculty strengths and should not be perceived as looking for weaknesses to overcome or errors to get rid of. It assumes that faculty see themselves as concerned, effective teachers and seeks to build support groups based on that foundation. (99)

The kind of positive support that is needed depends very heavily on the department chair. Many writers on the subject of professional development mention how vital the chair's role is in avoiding any suggestion that faculty development is remedial. The department chair must cultivate the kind of positive atmosphere which encourages faculty growth. To nurture such an environment, a department chair can do many things: advertise opportunities for renewal and change, encourage faculty to take risks and try new activities both in and out of the classroom. and foster discussion among all ranks and all ages as to the kinds of faculty development activities that are most useful and most rewarding. W. Todd Furniss suggests that "the key...to faculty careers that serve the institution, the student, and the faculty member is the psychological and intellectual milieu within which the faculty member works, and the key to that

milieu is the department chairman particularly, and his or her senior staff" (35). The department chair sets the tone for faculty development, and that tone will be positive if he or she "plays to the faculty strengths."

A third mode of thinking that needs review is the concept of a comprehensive, college-wide program aimed at all faculty members. This kind of thinking addresses all faculty members as if they were all the same and all needed the same kind of opportunities. Our survey results, however, indicate that some activities, such as industry experience, become more worthwhile as age increases; others, such as pursuing doctoral studies, decrease in importance and perceived effectiveness. Consequently, if policies maintain that any particular activity is good for ALL faculty members, those policies miss the point of faculty development; it must be multi-faceted, self-initiated, and individualized.

Gaff and others see a greater need for faculty to work "independently to revitalize themselves" (70). Instead of a limited list of activities available to everyone, what is needed according to our data is a wide array of individualized opportunities that will satisfy faculty in different disciplines, in different ranks, and at different stages in their lives.

These individualized opportunities need not be major or expensive undertakings. One possibility, for instance, is creative scheduling: a faculty member who regularly teaches a five-day week could be offered a four- or even three-day schedule. While this is already standard practice in some departments of some community colleges, it could be implemented with little effort and no expense. Such a schedule might be offered to a faculty member every second or

third year, not as a reward, but simply as an opportunity for pursuing professional development. While each professor's class load, student load, and pay would remain the same, he would have an extra day or two each week of that term for study, reflection or instructional improvement.

In an article entitled "Pragmatics of Faculty Self-Development," David G. Brown and William S. Hanger offer an excellent variety of self-development opportunities--142 of them in all--that are largely free. For instance, within a college "a sociologist and a historian switch jobs for a term." Such short-term exchanges would provide a fresh challenge to each of the faculty members involved and, ultimately, would broaden their interdisciplinary perspective.

Brown and Hanger also suggest a short-term faculty exchange with a foundation, government agency, or business firm: "a professor of finance with a corporation's trust officer," for example. They suggest that faculty "Experiment with the lecture method of instruction if you are using the discussion approach--and vice versa." Faculty often resist such seemingly simple suggestions and prefer to continue working with their old methods. But faculty members who commit themselves to such a change have the opportunity to organize and use old materials in new ways. The challenge is obvious and the cost to the college could be zero.

Faculty members can also develop themselves by making contact with practitioners in their fields. Brown and Hanger suggest monthly meetings; for instance, "the faculty of accountancy to visit with the personnel at a public accounting firm, the faculty of marketing to lunch regularly with the marketing department of department stores." The cost of such contact would be slight, and participating

faculty would form a network of coatacts with practitioners in their fields--contacts which could lead to a more formal business experience, a type of experience our survey found to be most helpful to faculty in some departments. Furthermore, the contacting faculty would become informed of current practices while practitioners would become updated on current theories.

Other suggestions by Brown and Hanger would be low in cost but equally rewarding: for instance, "Invite a media specialist to sit in on your class and offer constructive criticism," or "Videotape your instruction and have a group of peers evaluate it." While such suggestions may involve some minimal expense, the costs would be far outweighed by the benefits. Faculty, at very little or no expense to their college, would essentially be developing themselves. In sum, numerous professional development activities are already available to faculty that are not expensive.

A fourth and final mode of thinking--unfortunately entrenched in most college's policies--is the idea of evaluating and rewarding professional development. This, too, needs review. Deans at New Jersey's county colleges were asked if their schools rewarded those faculty who participated in professional development activities. Of the seventeen respondents, four answered "No" or "Not directly" or "Not particularly." Paradoxically, these responses could be positive and encouraging: they may show an awareness that the college reward structure is not, and should not be the primary reason for pursuing professional development. The motivation to pursue must come from within; external rewards, while they offer some incentive, should clearly be secondary.

Furthermore, we believe that faculty development should not be

evaluated because it cannot be accurately measured. By faculty development we are referring to anything from a year-long sabbatical to simply reading a book. The change and growth which occurs from such activities is personal, intellectual, and subjective. By its very nature it is not quantifiable. The purpose of such activities is to enrich the individual faculty member; that enrichment will naturally enrich his or her students, the ultimate beneficiaries of a faculty member's growth.

Professional development, therefore, should not be part of the faculty evaluation process, and faculty should not pursue such activities with the idea that they will be measured or rewarded by the college. Hammons, Wallace, and Watts argue that, unless there is a mutually acceptable contractual agreement, faculty development and faculty evaluation must be kept separate:

> It is a fatal mistake to mix the two. Given the nature of adult learners and the neo-sophistication of community college performance appraisal systems, any attempt to relate them will result in attendance, not involvement, and the application of objective measures (How many staff development sessions did you attend last year?) to a very subjective and internal activity. (54)

Recommendations

1. Professional development activities must be matched to specific disciplines and specific age groups. Teachers in different disciplines find different kinds of activities effective. No activity, as helpful as it may be to a particular group of faculty, should be universally encouraged.

2. For appropriate faculty (generally in higher ranks or in math, science, or business), industry experience should be pursued as a low-cost, effective method of professional development. One of the authors has been involved in such an industry-education partnership for two years. If a faculty member can be released from one or more courses per semester and the employing firm can compensate the college for the cost of a replacement adjunct, the program could be effected at no cost to the college and at a minimial cost to the participating firm.

3. Faculty who have pursued professional development activities should advise those who have not about which activities are the most rewarding. Such advice and counsel should be encouraged because, significantly, the activities which faculty plan to pursue (such as attending conferences and publishing) are not those that the more experienced faculty have found to have the greatest effect on teaching.

4. The faculty, although "graying" in terms of service to their college, are still relatively young and are not "graying" in terms of job challenge. The vast majority of respondents to our survey (88%) found their jobs either mostly or always challen-

ging. Faculty members mentioned keeping current in their fields, improving their teaching, and relationships with their students as the factors providing the most challenge in their jobs. Yet the majority of deans (11 out of 16) ranked their faculty as "somewhat" challenged. Few deans had specific plans to enhance job challenge; few mentioned improving teaching; none mentioned fostering faculty-student relationships. Clearly, policies at county colleges should nurture that existing challenge.

5. Factors related to teaching, such as recognition and well-prepared students, provide much greater challenge for faculty than do external factors such as working conditions and college policies. And factors related to teaching become increasingly important as faculty members grow older. The exact nature of "recognition" should be investigated fully in a future study because it remains unclear whether faculty seek this recognition from students, peers, administrators, the community, or from some combination of these. Still, the concept of recognition is such a highly valued challenge factor that its importance to faculty should be recognized by administrators in any future policy decisions regarding professional development.

It is particularly important that community colleges recognize these findings now while their faculties are still relatively young and while they still feel challenged. Of the faculty wno responded to our survey, only 4% were over sixty years old; only 1% were under thirty; the majority (56%) were between the ages of thirty and forty-five.

This majority, however, will not be "relatively young" forever. The statewide, voluntary turnover rate for faculty, as reported by the deans, has averaged less than 2% per year for the last five years. If this rate continues, and there is no reason to believe it will not, few new faculty will be hired because few current faculty will leave. The majority of the faculty in ten years will be in the forty-five to sixty age group and will have taught at their colleges for twenty years. Among this group there will be a much greater potential for "burnout."

There are benefits from increasing age, such as added experience and more developed teaching methodologies, but there is also a potential cost in stagnation that Peter Drucker calls "featherbedding." Drucker believes that unless the potential for burnout is addressed, colleges can become what he calls "the railroads of the knowledge industry" (133). Unless attitudes and policies toward professional development are altered, the possibilities for stagnation will increase dramatically over the next decade. This is especially true in New Jersey's county colleges where the majority of faculty is moving into middle age and beyond, where faculty turnover is very low and where opportunities for professional growth have been limited and often misdirected.

Now, while the faculty is still relatively young, is the time for county colleges to prepare for the future, to cultivate faculty development opportunities, and to build on that job challenge that currently exists.

Appendix 1

Questionnaire sent to the Academic Deans

of New Jersey's County Colleges

1. FACULTY
   a. Number of full time faculty as of January 1, 1985. _____
   b. Approximately what percent of current full time faculty were hired:
      (1) before 1973 _____
      (2) 1974 - 1980 _____
      (3) since 1980 _____
   c. Number of full time faculty in 1975 (approximate) _____

2. FACULTY TURNOVER
   Since 1980, approximately how many faculty have:
   a. left voluntarily to teach at another college? _____
   b. left voluntarily for a job in industry or government? _____
   c. left voluntarily to pursue further studies? _____
   d. left for all other reasons? _____

3. FACULTY PROFESSIONAL GROWTH
   Does your college:
   a. have a professional development committee? _____
   b. have a budget for professional development activities? _____
      Dollar amount of budget (if not confidential) _____
   c. support faculty sabbatical leaves? _____
   d. allow faculty unpaid leaves for further study or related employment? _____

   List below the types of professional development that your college encourages.

   Approximately what percent of your faculty uses those activities?

   Does your school reward those that participate in these activities? If so, how?

4. FACULTY ATTITUDES
   a. To what extent do you believe your faculty are bored?
      significantly somewhat not at all
   b. If you see this as a problem, what are you doing about it?

5. Your college _____
6. Your name and title _____

7. Would you like a copy of the results of this study? _____

Appendix 2

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

I. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

a. Considering the professional development activities that you have pursued during your employment at your college:
Place a "3" next to those activities that have had the greatest effect in making you a better teacher;
Place a "2" next to those activities that have had some effect;
Place a "1" next to those activities that have had little or no effect;
Place a "0" next to those activities you have not pursued.

(1)___ doctoral program
(2)___ other graduate work
(3)___ industry experience
(4)___ professional conferences
(5)___ publication
(6)___ other _____

(7) If you have not pursued such activities, why have you not done so?

b. Which of the following do you plan to pursue in the future? (Check all that apply.)

(8) ___ doctoral program
(9) ___ other graduate work
(10) ___ industry experience
(11) ___ professional conferences
(12) ___ publication
(13) ___ other _____

c. Of the rewards or incentives that your college provides to encourage you to pursue these activities,
Place a "3" next to those that provide the greatest incentive;
Place a "2" next to those that provide some incentive;
Place a "1" next to those that provide no incentive;
Place a "0" next to those that your college does not provide.

(14) ___ increased promotional opportunity
(15) ___ increased salary
(16) ___ released time
(17) ___ tuition reimbursement
(18) ___ sabbatical leave
(19) ___ other _____

d. How would you describe your college's attitude toward professional development?

(20) ___strongly encourages ___mildly encourages ___neutral ___discourages

e. Would a change in your college's attitude toward professional development affect your desire to pursue such activities?

(21) ___yes ___no ___don't know

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

II. JOB SATISFACTION

a. Do you find your job challenging?

(22) ___always ___most of the time ___infrequently ___never

b. If you do, what makes it challenging?
(23)

c. Which of the following would increase the challenge of your job or your satisfaction with it? (Check all that apply)
(24) ___ more pay
(25) ___ more control over course content and/or materials
(26) ___ more recognition for a job well done
(27) ___ a better maintained campus
(28) ___ better chances for advancement
(29) ___ a more understanding supervisor
(30) ___ better prepared students in class
(31) ___ more realistic college policies
(32) ___ increased interaction with other faculty
(33) ___ increased departmental responsibility in decision making

III. PERSONAL INFORMATION

a. Your department or discipline (34)_____

b. Your rank (35)_____

c. Number of years you have taught at your college:

(36) ___2 or less ___3-5 ___6-10 ___more than 10

d. Your age:

(37) ___under 30 ___30-45 ___46-60 ___over 60

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix 3

Tally of All 401 Respondents

Cross Tabulations by Rank

TALLY OF ALL 401 RESPONDENTS

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES PURSUED

	GREAT EFFECT		SOME EFFECT		NO EFFECT		NOT PURSUED		WEIGHTED AVERAGE
DOCTORAL	97	24%	45	11%	27	7%	231	58%	2.4
OTHER GRAD. WORK	104	26%	122	30%	50	12%	124	31%	2.21
INDUSTRY EXPER.	101	25%	59	15%	24	6%	216	54%	2.41
CONFERENCES	140	35%	179	45%	53	13%	28	7%	2.24
PUBLICATION	34	8%	96	24%	60	15%	210	52%	1.85
OTHER	81	20%	19	5%	4	1%	297	74%	2.73

PLANNED ACTIVITIES

	PLANNED		NOT PLANNED	
DOCTORAL	82	20%	316	79%
OTHER GRAD. WORK	152	38%	247	62%
INDUSTRY EXPER.	140	35%	259	65%
CONFERENCES	345	86%	52	13%
PUBLICATION	209	52%	191	48%
OTHER	74	18%	323	81%

REASONS FOR NOT PURSUING SUCH ACTIVITIES

NO RESPONSE	311	78%
NO INTEREST	9	2%
COSTS EXCEED BENEFITS	12	3%
NOT NECESSARY	5	1%
COULDN'T FIND RELEVANT PROGRAM	15	4%
NO TIME	28	7%
NO INCENTIVE	8	2%
JUST BEGAN TEACHING	4	1%
TIME AND MONEY	3	1%
OTHER	11	3%

PERCEPTIONS OF INCENTIVES

	GREATEST		SOME		NONE		NOT PROVIDED		WEIGHTED AVERAGE
PROMOTION	111	28%	153	38%	63	16%	73	18%	2.15
SALARY INCREASE	95	24%	124	31%	74	18%	107	27%	2.08
RELEASED TIME	68	17%	86	21%	80	20%	166	41%	1.95
TUITION REIMB.	93	23%	170	42%	68	17%	69	17%	2.07
SABBATICAL	113	28%	124	31%	69	17%	94	23%	2.14
OTHER	23	6%	4	1%	1	0%	372	93%	2.86

COLLEGE'S ATTITUDE TOWARD PROF. DEVELOPMENT

STRONGLY ENCOURAGES	MILDLY ENCOURAGES	NEUTRAL	DISCOURAGES	WEIGHTED AVERAGE
90	207	69	34	2.88
22%	52%	17%	8%	

WOULD A CHANGE IN YOUR COLLEGE'S ATTITUDE AFFECT YOUR DESIRE

YES	NO	DON'T KNOW
190	132	78
47%	33%	19%

DO YOU FIND YOUR JOB CHALLENGING?

ALWAYS	MOSTLY	SELDOM	NEVER	WEIGHTED AVER.
105	248	46	1	3.14
26%	62%	11%	0%	

WHAT MAKES THE JOB CHALLENGING?

NO RESPONSE	75	19%
STUDENT INTERACTION	124	31%
MANY DUTIES; SOLVING PROBLEMS; VARIETY	25	6%
KEEPING SELF AND CONTENT CURRENT	43	11%
STUDENT INTERACTION & KEEPING CURRENT	57	14%
HELPING STUDENTS LEARN	13	3%
THE SUBJECT ITSELF	5	1%
NEW COURSE AND PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT	7	2%
THE JOB ITSELF - TEACHING	35	9%
PERSONAL CHALLENGE; INTERNAL DRIVE	20	5%
OTHER	4	1%

ANSWERS TO MOTIVATION QUESTIONS

PAY	238	59%
ACHIEVEMENT	61	15%
RECOGNITION	276	69%
WORKING CONDITIONS	87	22%
ADVANCEMENT	166	41%
SUPERVISION	42	10%
BETTER PREPARED STUDENTS	229	57%
COLLEGE POLICIES	119	30%
INTERPERS. REL'SHIPS	154	38%
RESPONSIBILITY	117	29%

RANK

INSTRUCTOR	ASST.PROF.	ASSO.PROF	FULL PROF.
54	117	160	61
13%	29%	40%	15%

YEARS TAUGHT AT COLLEGE

2 OR LESS	3 TO 5	6 TO 10	MORE THAN 10
21	42	80	255
5%	10%	20%	64%

AGE

UNDER 30	30 TO 45	46 TO 60	OVER 60
4	225	156	14
1%	56%	39%	3%

NUMBER OF RESPONSES TABULATED: 401

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TALLY OF ALL ALL INSTRUCTORS

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES PURSUED

	GREAT EFFECT		SOME EFFECT		NO EFFECT		NOT PURSUED		WEIGHTED AVERAGE
DOCTORAL	8	15%	1	2%	3	6%	42	78%	2.39
OTHER GRAD. WORK	10	19%	13	24%	9	17%	22	41%	2.03
INDUSTRY EXPER.	11	20%	11	20%	2	4%	30	56%	2.36
CONFERENCES	16	30%	23	43%	9	17%	6	11%	2.14
PUBLICATION	2	4%	12	22%	6	11%	34	63%	1.81
OTHER	12	22%	2	4%	1	2%	39	72%	2.71

PLANNED ACTIVITIES

	PLANNED		NOT PLANNED	
DOCTORAL	22	41%	32	59%
OTHER GRAD. WORK	26	48%	28	52%
INDUSTRY EXPER.	18	33%	36	67%
CONFERENCES	40	74%	14	26%
PUBLICATION	26	48%	28	52%
OTHER	6	11%	48	89%

REASONS FOR NOT PURSUING SUCH ACTIVITIES

NO RESPONSE	39	72%
NO INTEREST	1	2%
COSTS EXCEED BENEFITS	2	4%
NOT NECESSARY	0	0%
COULDN'T FIND RELEVANT PROGRAM	3	6%
NO TIME	5	9%
NO INCENTIVE	1	2%
JUST BEGAN TEACHING	1	2%
TIME & MONEY	1	2%
OTHER	1	2%

PERCEPTIONS OF INCENTIVES

	GREATEST		SOME		NONE		NOT PROVIDED		WEIGHTED AVERAGE
PROMOTION	23	43%	20	37%	6	11%	5	9%	2.35
SALARY INCREASE	17	31%	17	31%	9	17%	11	20%	2.18
RELEASED TIME	11	20%	10	19%	15	28%	18	33%	1.88
TUITION REIMB.	19	35%	20	37%	9	17%	6	11%	2.2
SABBATICAL	9	17%	20	37%	9	17%	16	30%	2
OTHER	4	7%	0	0%	0	0%	50	93%	3

COLLEGE'S ATTITUDE TOWARD PROF. DEVELOPMENT

STRONGLY ENCOURAGES	MILDLY ENCOURAGES	NEUTRAL	DISCOURAGES	WEIGHTED AVERAGE
14	25	12	3	2.93
26%	46%	22%	6%	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

WOULD A CHANGE IN YOUR COLLEGE'S ATTITUDE AFFECT YOUR DESIRE?

YES	NO	DON'T KNOW
26	17	11
48%	31%	20%

DO YOU FIND YOUR JOB CHALLENGING?

ALWAYS	MOSTLY	SELDOM	NEVER	WEIGHTED AVER.
17	32	5	0	3.22
31%	59%	9%	0%	

WHAT MAKES THE JOB CHALLENGING?

NO RESPONSE	9	17%
STUDENT INTERACTION	21	39%
MANY DUTIES; SOLVING PROBLEMS; VARIETY	2	4%
KEEPING SELF AND CONTENT CURRENT	9	17%
STUDENT INTERACTION & KEEPING CURRENT	10	19%
HELPING STUDENTS LEARN	0	0%
THE SUBJECT ITSELF	0	0%
NEW COURSE AND PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT	0	0%
TEACHING; FINDING BETTER METHODS	3	6%
PERSONAL CHALLENGE; INTERNAL DRIVE	0	0%
OTHER	0	0%

ANSWERS TO MOTIVATION QUESTIONS

PAY	33	61%
ACHIEVEMENT	11	20%
RECOGNITION	34	63%
WORKING CONDITIONS	5	9%
ADVANCEMENT	32	59%
SUPERVISION	4	7%
BETTER PREPARED STUDENTS	24	44%
COLLEGE POLICIES	13	24%
INTERPERS. REL'SHIPS	22	41%
RESPONSIBILITY	11	20%

RANK

INSTRUCTOR	ASST.PROF.	ASSO.PROF.	FULL PROF.
54	0	0	0
100%	0%	0%	0%

YEARS TAUGHT AT COLLEGE

2 OR LESS	3 TO 5	6 TO 10	MORE THAN 10
13	20	14	7
24%	37%	26%	13%

AGE

UNDER 30	30 TO 45	46 TO 60	OVER 60
4	37	13	0
7%	69%	24%	0%

NUMBER OF RESPONSES TABULATED: 54

TALLY OF ALL ASSISTANT PROFESSORS

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES PURSUED

	GREAT EFFECT		SOME EFFECT		NO EFFECT		NOT PURSUED		WEIGHTED AVERAGE
DOCTORAL	24	21%	9	8%	5	4%	78	67%	2.52
OTHER GRAD. WORK	26	22%	39	33%	15	13%	36	31%	2.13
INDUSTRY EXPER.	31	26%	16	14%	8	7%	61	52%	2.4
CONFERENCES	44	38%	51	44%	14	12%	7	6%	2.28
PUBLICATION	10	9%	27	23%	19	16%	60	51%	1.85
OTHER	23	20%	6	5%	1	1%	87	74%	2.73

PLANNED ACTIVITIES

	PLANNED		NOT PLANNED	
DOCTORAL	29	25%	86	74%
OTHER GRAD. WORK	54	46%	62	53%
INDUSTRY EXPER.	42	36%	74	63%
CONFERENCES	104	89%	11	9%
PUBLICATION	72	62%	44	38%
OTHER	20	17%	96	82%

REASONS FOR NOT PURSUING SUCH ACTIVITIES

NO RESPONSE	81	69%
NO INTEREST	6	5%
COSTS EXCEED BENEFITS	3	3%
NOT NECESSARY	2	2%
COULDN'T FIND RELEVANT PROGRAM	5	4%
NO TIME	11	9%
NO INCENTIVE	2	2%
JUST BEGAN TEACHING	2	2%
TIME & MONEY	2	2%
OTHER	3	3%

PERCEPTIONS OF INCENTIVES

	GREATEST		SOME		NONE		NOT PROVIDED		WEIGHTED AVERAGE
PROMOTION	28	24%	52	44%	15	13%	22	19%	2.14
SALARY INCREASE	35	30%	36	31%	20	17%	26	22%	2.17
RELEASED TIME	20	17%	29	25%	21	18%	47	40%	1.98
TUITION REIMB.	30	26%	53	45%	17	15%	17	15%	2.13
SABBATICAL	26	22%	39	33%	24	21%	28	24%	2.01
OTHER	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	116	99%	3

COLLEGE'S ATTITUDE TOWARD PROF. DEVELOPMENT

STRONGLY ENCOURAGES	MILDLY ENCOURAGES	NEUTRAL	DISCOURAGES	WEIGHTED AVERAGE
32	60	15	10	2.97
27%	51%	13%	9%	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

WOULD A CHANGE IN YOUR COLLEGE'S ATTITUDE AFFECT YOUR DESIRE:

YES	NO	DON'T KNOW
62	33	22
53%	28%	19%

DO YOU FIND YOUR JOB CHALLENGING?

ALWAYS	MOSTLY	SELDOM	NEVER	WEIGHTED AVER.
27	77	13	0	3.12
23%	66%	11%	0%	

WHAT MAKES THE JOB CHALLENGING?

NO RESPONSE	22	19%
STUDENT INTERACTION	35	30%
MANY DUTIES; SOLVING PROBLEMS; VARIETY	7	6%
KEEPING SELF AND CONTENT CURRENT	8	7%
STUDENT INTERACTION & KEEPING CURRENT	19	16%
HELPING STUDENTS LEARN	6	5%
THE SUBJECT ITSELF	1	1%
NEW COURSE AND PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT	1	1%
TEACHING; FINDING BETTER METHODS	13	11%
PERSONAL CHALLENGE; INTERNAL DRIVE	2	2%
OTHER	3	3%

ANSWERS TO MOTIVATION QUESTIONS

PAY	84	72%
ACHIEVEMENT	22	19%
RECOGNITION	80	68%
WORKING CONDITIONS	22	19%
ADVANCEMENT	65	56%
SUPERVISION	14	12%
BETTER PREPARED STUDENTS	68	58%
COLLEGE POLICIES	36	31%
INTERPERS. REL'SHIPS	51	44%
RESPONSIBILITY	41	35%

RANK

INSTRUCTOR	ASST. PROF.	ASSO. PROF.	FULL PROF.
0	117	0	0
0%	100%	0%	0%

YEARS TAUGHT AT COLLEGE

2 OR LESS	3 TO 5	6 TO 10	MORE THAN 10
7	18	36	56
6%	15%	31%	48%

AGE

UNDER 30	30 TO 45	46 TO 60	OVER 60
0	87	27	3
0%	74%	23%	3%

NUMBER OF RESPONSES TABULATED: 117

TALLY OF ALL ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS

END OF DATA

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES PURSUED

BREAK IN 130
)

	GREAT EFFECT		SOME EFFECT		NO EFFECT		NOT PURSUED		WEIGHTED AVERAGE
DOCTORAL	38	24%	24	15%	13	8%	85	53%	2.34
OTHER GRAD. WORK	43	27%	49	31%	21	13%	47	29%	2.2
INDUSTRY EXPER.	43	27%	23	14%	8	5%	86	54%	2.48
CONFERENCES	55	34%	71	44%	21	13%	13	8%	2.23
PUBLICATION	12	8%	35	22%	25	16%	88	55%	1.83
OTHER	33	21%	6	4%	2	1%	119	74%	2.77

PLANNED ACTIVITIES

	PLANNED		NOT PLANNED	
DOCTORAL	29	18%	130	81%
OTHER GRAD. WORK	53	33%	106	66%
INDUSTRY EXPER.	60	38%	99	62%
CONFERENCES	139	87%	20	13%
PUBLICATION	70	44%	90	56%
OTHER	33	21%	125	78%

REASONS FOR NOT PURSUING SUCH ACTIVITIES

NO RESPONSI	130	81%
NO INTERES1	1	1%
COSTS EXCEEu BENEFITS	6	4%
NOT NECESSARY	2	1%
COULDN'T FIND RELEVANT PROGRAM	7	4%
NO TIME	8	5%
NO INCENTIVE	4	3%
JUST BEGAN TEACHING	0	0%
TIME & MONEY	0	0%
OTHER	2	1%

PERCEPTIONS OF INCENTIVES

	GREATEST		SOME		NONE		NOT PROVIDED		WEIGHTED AVERAGE
PROMOTION	46	29%	57	36%	31	19%	26	16%	2.12
SALARY INCREASE	31	19%	46	29%	35	22%	48	30%	1.96
RELEASED TIME	21	13%	30	19%	34	21%	75	47%	1.85
TUITION REIMB.	27	17%	67	42%	33	21%	33	21%	1.95
SABBATICAL	47	29%	46	29%	30	19%	37	23%	2.13
OTHER	15	9%	3	2%	1	1%	141	88%	2.67

COLLEGE'S ATTITUDE TOWARD PROF. DEVELOPMENT

STRONGLY ENCOURAGES	MILDLY ENCOURAGES	NEUTRAL	DISCOURAGES	WEIGHTED AVERAGE
25	83	36	16	2.73
16%	52%	23%	10%	

WOULD A CHANGE IN YOUR COLLEGE'S ATTITUDE AFFECT YOUR DESIRE?

YES	NO	DON'T KNOW
74	53	33
46%	33%	21%

DO YOU FIND YOUR JOB CHALLENGING?

ALWAYS	MOSTLY	SELDOM	NEVER	WEIGHTED AVER.
43	100	17	0	3.16
27%	63%	11%	0%	

WHAT MAKES THE JOB CHALLENGING?

NO RESPONSE	29	18%
STUDENT INTERACTION	49	31%
MANY DUTIES; SOLVING PROBLEMS; VARIETY	9	6%
KEEPING SELF AND CONTENT CURRENT	18	11%
STUDENT INTERACTION & KEEPING CURRENT	25	16%
HELPING STUDENTS LEARN	6	4%
THE SUBJECT ITSELF	3	2%
NEW COURSE AND PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT	4	3%
TEACHING; FINDING BETTER METHODS	9	6%
PERSONAL CHALLENGE; INTERNAL DRIVE	7	4%
OTHER	1	1%

ANSWERS TO MOTIVATION QUESTIONS

PAY	85	53%
ACHIEVEMENT	21	13%
RECOGNITION	109	68%
WORKING CONDITIONS	38	24%
ADVANCEMENT	52	33%
SUPERVISION	14	9%
BETTER PREPARED STUDENTS	97	61%
COLLEGE POLICIES	49	31%
INTERPERS. REL'SHIPS	57	36%
RESPONSIBILITY	48	30%

RANK

INSTRUCTOR	ASST.PROF.	ASSO.PROF.	FULL PROF.
0	0	160	0
0%	0%	100%	0%

YEARS TAUGHT AT COLLEGE

2 OR LESS	3 TO 5	6 TO 10	MORE THAN 10
1	2	29	128
1%	1%	18%	80%

AGE

UNDER 30	30 TO 45	46 TO 60	OVER 60
0	76	77	6
0%	48%	48%	4%

NUMBER OF RESPONSES TABULATED: 160

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TALLY OF ALL FULL PROFESSORS

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES PURSUED

	GREAT EFFECT		SOME EFFECT		NO EFFECT		NOT PURSUED		WEIGHTED AVERAGE
DOCTORAL	27	44%	11	18%	5	8%	18	30%	2.51
OTHER GRAD. WORK	22	36%	20	33%	3	5%	16	26%	2.42
INDUSTRY EXPER.	14	23%	8	13%	6	10%	33	54%	2.20
CONFERENCES	21	34%	31	51%	8	13%	1	2%	2.21
PUBLICATION	9	15%	20	33%	7	11%	25	41%	2.07
OTHER	11	18%	4	7%	0	0%	46	75%	2.72

PLANNED ACTIVITIES

	PLANNED		NOT PLANNED	
DOCTORAL	2	3%	59	97%
OTHER GRAD. WORK	18	30%	43	70%
INDUSTRY EXPER.	17	28%	44	72%
CONFERENCES	55	90%	5	8%
PUBLICATION	38	62%	23	38%
OTHER	14	23%	47	77%

REASONS FOR NOT PURSUING SUCH ACTIVITIES

NO RESPONSE	54	89%
NO INTEREST	1	2%
COSTS EXCEED BENEFITS	0	0%
NOT NECESSARY	0	0%
COULDN'T FIND RELEVANT PROGRAM	0	0%
NO TIME	4	7%
NO INCENTIVE	1	2%
JUST BEGAN TEACHING	1	2%
TIME & MONEY	0	0%
OTHER	0	0%

PERCEPTIONS OF INCENTIVES

	GREATEST		SOME		NONE		NOT PROVIDED		WEIGHTED AVERAGE
PROMOTION	13	21%	22	36%	10	16%	16	26%	2.07
SALARY INCREASE	12	20%	23	38%	7	11%	19	31%	2.13
RELEASED TIME	14	23%	16	26%	8	13%	23	38%	2.16
TUITION REIMB.	15	25%	26	43%	8	13%	12	20%	2.15
SABBATICAL	31	51%	14	23%	5	8%	11	18%	2.52
OTHER	3	5%	1	2%	0	0%	57	93%	2.71

COLLEGE'S ATTITUDE TOWARD PROF. DEVELOPMENT

STRONGLY ENCOURAGES	MILDLY ENCOURAGES	NEUTRAL	DISCOURAGES	WEIGHTED AVERAGE
18	36	4	3	3.13
30%	59%	7%	5%	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

WOULD A CHANGE IN YOUR COLLEGE'S ATTITUDE AFFECT YOUR DESIRE?

YES	NO	DON'T KNOW
26	26	9
43%	43%	15%

DO YOU FIND YOUR JOB CHALLENGING?

ALWAYS	MOSTLY	SELDOM	NEVER	WEIGHTED AVER.
17	35	9	0	3.13
28%	57%	15%	0%	

WHAT MAKES THE JOB CHALLENGING?

NO RESPONSE	11	18%
STUDENT INTERACTION	19	31%
MANY DUTIES; SOLVING PROBLEMS; VARIETY	5	8%
KEEPING SELF AND CONTENT CURRENT	7	11%
STUDENT INTERACTION & KEEPING CURRENT	3	5%
HELPING STUDENTS LEARN	1	2%
THE SUBJECT ITSELF	1	2%
NEW COURSE AND PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT	2	3%
TEACHING; FINDING BETTER METHODS	10	16%
PERSONAL CHALLENGE; INTERNAL DRIVE	2	3%
OTHER	0	0%

ANSWERS TO MOTIVATION QUESTIONS

PAY	30	49%
ACHIEVEMENT	6	10%
RECOGNITION	47	77%
WORKING CONDITIONS	19	31%
ADVANCEMENT	11	18%
SUPERVISION	9	15%
BETTER PREPARED STUDENTS	37	61%
COLLEGE POLICIES	19	31%
INTERPERS. REL'SHIPS	21	34%
RESPONSIBILITY	15	25%

RANK

INSTRUCTOR	ASST.PROF.	ASSO.PROF.	FULL PROF.
0	0	0	61
0%	0%	0%	100%

YEARS TAUGHT AT COLLEGE

2 OR LESS	3 TO 5	6 TO 10	MORE THAN 10
0	0	1	60
0%	0%	2%	98%

AGE

UNDER 30	30 TO 45	46 TO 60	OVER 60
0	19	38	4
0%	31%	62%	7%

NUMBER OF RESPONSES TABULATED: 61

List of References

Brown, David G. and William S. Hanger. "Pragmatics of Faculty Self-Development." EDUCATIONAL RECORD 56 (1975): pp. 201-206.

Cohen, Arthur M. and Florence B. Brawer. THE AMERICAN COMMUNITY COLLEGE. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982.

Drucker, Peter F. "The Professor as Featherbedder."

Furniss, W. Todd. RESHAPING FACULTY CAREERS. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1981.

Gaff, Sally Shake, Concord Festa, and Jerry G. Gaff. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: A GUIDE TO RESOURCES. NP: Change Magazine Press, 1978.

Hammons, Jim, Terry H. Smith Wallace, and Gordon Watts. STAFF DEVELOPMENT IN THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE: A HANDBOOK. Los Angeles: ERIC, 1978.

Lacey, Paul A. "The Politics of Vitalizing Teaching." in REVITALIZING TEACHING THROUGH FACULTY DEVELOPMENT. ed. Paul A. Lacey. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1983.

Melendez, Winfred Albizu, and Rafael M. de Guzman. BURNOUT: THE NEW ACADEMIC DISEASE. Washington D.C.: ASHE, 1983.

Phillips, Steven R. "What, Then, IS Faculty Development?" ADE (Association of Departments of English) Bulletin, May 1976, pp. 11-17.

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE
FOR JUNIOR COLLEGES

MAR 21 1986